

California's Child and Family Services Review System Improvement Plan

County:	Tehama
Responsible County Child Welfare Agency:	Tehama County Department of Social Services
Period of Plan:	September 25, 2009 – September 24, 2012
Period of Outcomes Data:	Quarter 4 2008, July 2009 Quarterly Data Report
Date Submitted:	October 28, 2009
County Contact Person for County System Improvement Plan	
Name:	Abigale Henderson
Title:	Program Manager, Child Welfare Services
Address:	310 S. Main Street, Red Bluff 96080
Phone/Email	(530) 528-4020 ahenderson@tcdss.org
Submitted by each agency for the children under its care	
Submitted by:	County Child Welfare Agency Director (Lead Agency)
Name:	Charlene Reid, MSW
Signature:	<i>Charlene Reid</i>
Submitted by:	County Chief Probation Officer (Interim)
Name:	Renny Noll
Signature:	<i>Renny Noll</i>

SIP 2009
TABLE OF CONTENTS

SIP NARRATIVE

<u>SECTION 1 PROCESS FOR CONDUCTING SIP</u>	<u>2</u>
1.a TEAM MEMBERSHIP	2
1.b DATA SOURCES	4
1.c DECISION MAKING	4
<u>SECTION 2 OUTCOMES IDENTIFIED FOR IMPROVEMENT</u>	<u>4</u>
2.a THEMES IDENTIFIED IN CSA AND PQCR	4
<u>SECTION 3 IMPROVEMENT TARGETS OR GOALS</u>	<u>6</u>
3.a OUTCOME TARGET GOAL SELECTION PROCESS	6
<u>SECTION 4 SUMMARY OF CURRENT RESEARCH AVAILABLE</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>SECTION 5 SUMMARY OF CURRENT ACTIVITIES IN PLACE OR PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTED</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>SECTION 6 NEW ACTIVITIES</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>SECTION 7 LINK BETWEEN ACTIVITIES AND OUTCOME IMPROVEMENT</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>SECTION 8 INTEGRATION BETWEEN CSA, PQCR, AND CWS/PROBATION PLANNING PROCESS AND CAPIT/CBCAP/PSSF PLAN</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>ATTACHMENT 1 CSA EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u>	<u>11</u>
<u>ATTACHMENT 2 PQCR EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>PART 1. CWS/PROBATION</u>	<u>14</u>
a. CWS/PROBATION NARRATIVE	14
b. CWS/PROBATION MATRIX	17
c. CWSOIP NARRATIVE	30

SIP Narrative

1. Process for Conducting SIP

a. Team Membership

The SIP development team included the CWS Program Manager, CWS Supervisors, the Department's Staff Services Analyst assigned to CWS (who also functions as the CAPIT/CBCAP/PSSF Liaison), and the Juvenile Probation Division Director. The team was also informed by feedback from CWS Social Workers, and information gleaned through surveying the following stakeholders:

Required Core Representatives

- CAPC
 - Linda Kenyon Rose, President
- County Children's Trust Fund Commission (CCTF)
 - Tehama County's CAPCC acts as the CCTF Commission. See above.
- County BOS designated agency to administer CAPIT/CBCAP/PSSF Programs
 - Charlene Reid, Director, Tehama County Department of Social Services
- County Health Department
 - Sydnei Wilby, PHN, Director, Tehama County Health Services Agency, Public Health Division
- County Mental Health Department
 - Ann Houghtby, MFH, Director, Tehama County Health Services Agency, Mental Health Division
- CWS administrators, managers, and social workers (includes CAPIT/CBCAP/PSSF Liaisons)
 - See above
- Foster Youth
- Juvenile Court Bench Officer
 - Judge Edward King
- Native American Tribes served within the community
 - Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians
- Parents/Consumers
 - Ronda Dougherty, CWS Parent Partner/Former Consumer
- Probation administrators, supervisors, and officers
 - Renny Noll, Interim Chief Probation Officer
 - Greg Ulloa, Juvenile Division Director
- PSSF Collaborative
 - Tehama County's CAPCC acts as the PSSF Collaborative. See above.
- Resource families and other caregivers

Recommended Stakeholders

- County Alcohol and Drug Department
 - Susan McVean, Director, Tehama County Health Services Agency, Drug and Alcohol Division
- County Children and Families Commission (Prop. 10 Commission)
 - Denise Snider, Director, First 5 Tehama
- Department of Developmental Services (DDS) Regional Center
 - Far Northern Regional Center
- Domestic Violence Prevention Provider
 - Clara Osborne, Executive Director, Alternatives to Violence
- Education
 - Tehama County Department of Education
- Law enforcement
 - Danny Rabalais, Tehama County Sheriff's Office
- Public Housing Authority
- Regional Training Academy
 - Susan Brooks, Program Director, Northern California Training Academy, UC Davis Extension, University of California
- Representatives from Businesses
- Service Providers
- Workforce Investment Board
 - Kathy Schmitz, Job Training Center, WIA Member
- County Counsel
 - Sylvia Duran, Deputy County Counsel assigned to CWS
- Various Community-Based Organizations and Other Service Providers
 - Triad Family Services
 - DayStar Ranch
 - Other anonymous respondents in these categories

b. Data Sources

Data for the CSA and SIP were gathered from SafeMeasures, CWS Outcomes System Summary Reports and other data compiled and published by UC Berkeley Center for Social Services Research, as well as from other custom reports developed in the county utilizing data from CWS/CMS in Business Objects reports and data from the Efforts to Outcomes (ETO) Team Decision making (TDM) database.

c. Decision Making

The CWS Program Manager and CWS Social Worker Supervisors made decisions with the assistance of the Staff Services Analyst and feedback from the CWS Social Workers, using information from the data sources listed above, feedback from stakeholders, the CSA, and results of the PQCR. Decisions were made via a process of the Program Manager developing a draft of the SIP after discussion with supervisors and the Staff Services Analyst about SIP priorities, using feedback from the above-named sources, and then receiving feedback on the draft, and making

requested revisions. Since the Program Manager was in the process of retiring, the Tehama County DSS Deputy Director has been closely involved with this process.

2. Outcomes Identified for Improvement

a. Themes Identified in the CSA and PQCR

The following themes were identified in the CSA:

- *Youth in Care more than 24 months without a Permanent Plan:* Factors which likely influence the length of time a child/youth will be in care longer than 24 months without a permanent plan include a longer median time to reunification and/or an increased rate of failed reunification (re-entry following reunification); delays in implementing concurrent planning, and delays with finalization of adoption. Tehama County rate of exits to permanency for youth in care 24 months or longer has been declining. Court delays, delays in finalizing adoptions, and lack of early concurrent planning likely all contribute to this factor.
- *Placement Stability:* Tehama County has been improving in the area of placement stability, except in the area of children and youth in care for more than 24 months. In this area, performance has been declining. Research shows that the longer a child/youth has been in care without a permanent plan, the more likely this child/youth will suffer multiple placement changes. As Tehama County makes better use of risk of removal and emergency placement TDM's, and places more focus on initial placement with relatives and NREFM's, placement stability should improve.
- *Timely Response:* Tehama County has made good improvements with timely response, which was a goal in the county's last two SIPs. However in the past six months the figures have shown a dramatic downward shift in performance. Some factors which were discussed in the CSA were a change in unit structure, which resulted in a learning curve for three of four supervisors, in the area of monitoring emergency response. As could be reasonably expected after the first few months of learning and adjustment to this change an improvement in timely response was shown. However there has since been a sharp dip in performance over a recent two or three month period. Some factors which may have some bearing on this decreased performance are the assignment of a specific supervisor to oversee the intake screeners and this person needing to get comfortable in this new role; social worker noncompliance regarding recording contacts; and a large hit on the unit outstationed in Corning (south county) when a local task force made a sizeable methamphetamine sweep/bust in May of 2009. Corrective actions are already being put into place to resolve social worker compliance with data entry and the workload issues in the Corning unit.
- *Timely Social Worker Contacts:* Tehama County has demonstrated a decline recently in timeliness of recorded social worker contacts. This could be due to one or more of the following factors: contacts are not recorded in a

timely fashion; contact waivers in case plans are not current; social workers are meeting with clients monthly, but not within 30 days of the previous contact; social workers in the Coming outstationed unit are carrying vertical caseloads, and are not able to make mandated monthly contacts due to the timeline pressures of immediate and 10-day responses required for referrals and detention/jurisdictional and dispositional reports. For a period of time, an extra-help social worker was monitoring the non-dependent legal guardian cases, and was not instructed to update case plans, thus contact waivers for those cases were not current. Measures to correct these issues are already being initiated. They are:

- a. Supervisors are using Safe Measures more and checking more.
- b. Many contact were not in compliance due to an oversight on many non-dependent legal guardianship cases not having updated case plans, so the every six-month contact changed to monthly, and we were out of compliance on those.

Tehama County chose Placement Stability as the focus for its PQCR in September 2008. Findings from the PQCR included:

- Barriers to parent/youth engagement with their case plans included parents who were incarcerated, resistance on the part of parents/youth, and a lack of effective strategies being used by social workers.
- Common barriers to timely reunification included high caseloads and multiple case transfers.
- A noted barrier to effective concurrent planning was not having a concurrent plan in place at the beginning/onset of the case.
- An issue identified as contributing to lessened placement stability was that the decisions for placement were made on availability of a bed, rather than appropriateness of fit.
- Another issue identified as related to placement stability was foster parent retention, affected in part by placing children with behavioral challenges with caregivers with little to no experience.

3. Improvement Targets or Goals

a. Outcome Target Goal Selection Process

Tehama County did not use the composite planner for identifying improvement goals, as it was not found to be terribly useful in this size county with a small data set and because training on the planner was not able to be scheduled in time for application of such to the CA-CFSR CSA and SIP processes. Tehama County did use the PQCR

findings and other data as mentioned above, as well as feedback from social workers and stakeholders for identifying improvement goals. As a small county, Tehama CWS is able to closely observe practice, and to relate those observations to current research, for example the research on placement stability and participatory case planning reviewed in preparation for the PQCR.

Tehama's improvement goals are centered around the county's data related to the Long Term Care and Placement Stability Composites. Tehama will be focusing on improved rates of reunification and lowered rates of re-entry, based on the belief that optimal permanency plan for children and youth is to return home and to remain home. Correct use of the Structured Decision-making (SDM) tool, including the Family Strengths and Needs Assessment (FSNA), enhances the participatory case planning process, which research shows leads to better reunification outcomes. Expertise with and use of motivational interviewing helps to remove the barrier of resistance for clients, thus both speeding up the reunification process, and helping to solidify the gains made, which reduces recidivism. Another factor in reducing recidivism is connecting the family to a supportive community to help them to remain drug and alcohol free and to be able to maintain their stability as a family.

Improved use of the TDM process can help in several areas. Improved use of the risk of removal and emergency placement TDMs provide an opportunity to coordinate support around a family unit so the child(ren) can remain home, or if placement is necessary TDM provides a forum for engaging the family in the identification of a placement with a person who is familiar to the child(ren) and ideally in their own neighborhood and school district, such as a relative or non-related extended family member, which research shows can better support reunification, placement stability, and permanency for the child/youth should reunification fail.

Appropriate implementation of concurrent planning early on in a case can both support reunification efforts and support placement stability and permanence for children/youth should reunification fail.

The outcome/goal selection process revolved around Tehama's concerns regarding the numbers of children/youth in care 24 months or longer without a permanent plan. With the premise that the best permanent plan for a child/youth is to remain or return home safely, and that the next best permanent plan is permanency with a relative or other person close to the child, ideally in his or her own neighborhood, and school district, and with siblings, the improvement goals selected focus on placement at home and/or reunification without re-entry and placement with relatives or NREFMs who can support reunification while still offering permanency. All of this is better accomplished through improved client engagement, participatory case planning, concurrent planning, and the TDM process.

4. Summary of Current Research Available

UC Davis prepared two research papers which relate to Tehama County's chosen

improvement goals.

A Literature Review of Placement Stability in Child Welfare Services: Issues,

Concerns, Outcomes, and Future Directions was prepared by the Northern California Training Academy, University of California, Davis, Extension, the Center for Human Services, in August of 2008. The basic findings of this research paper are:

- It is important to minimize the number of changes children experience.
- Some key components for improving practices for increasing the probability for placement stability include:
 - Strong tracking and case planning to ensure that “foster drift” is avoided to achieve permanence
 - Early intervention
 - Increasing the availability and use of placement choice
 - It is essential that children are moved because of their identified needs, not because of unavailability of placements
 - Increasing multi-agency support
 - There is strong and conclusive evidence that providing support to foster parents (and kin) reduces the likelihood that a placement disruption will occur.

Participatory Planning in Child Welfare Services Literature Review: Selected Models, Components and Research Findings, was prepared by The University of California, Davis, Extension, the Center for Human Services, in July of 2008.

This paper concludes that while there is not conclusive evidence that participatory models such as Family Group Conferencing and Wraparound services are effective in improving outcomes for children and families in the long term, there is encouraging and positive evidence. “The research generated thus far illustrates the effectiveness of the participatory planning model, mainly involving families in the decision making process for contributing to some positive outcomes for families and children.” Findings are that families “...exhibit greater commitment to receiving services and feel more empowered when they are involved in contributing to decisions that affect them and their families.”

TDM is one of the four core strategies of the Family-to-Family initiative, which is an evidence-based model, which has demonstrated success in the areas of out-of-home placement prevention, better identification of needs and placement matching when out-of-home care is necessary, enhancing placement stability and permanence, and improved reunification and/or exits from care outcomes.

5. Summary of Current Activities in Place or Partially Implemented

The restructure of the units, which took place in late 2008, has positively affected the flow of cases through the units. Each unit is now a vertical unit, and all members of each unit are aware of and gain knowledge of the case as it enters the unit, so that the case transition is

smooth. The ongoing social worker is informed of her/his assignment to a case at the time it is assigned to the court social worker. This way the ongoing social worker can also be involved in the development of the case plan with the client. The members of each unit team with one another on the cases, and can provide coverage for one another.

All of the social workers and all of the supervisors have been trained in motivational interviewing, which evidence shows has a positive influence in early engagement of and motivation of clients. The three court social workers in the Red Bluff office and two of the social workers in the Corning office have been assigned motivational interviewing coaches to enhance their learning of and performance in this model.

The Northern California Training Academy has assigned two trained facilitators to do case readings regarding the effective use of SDM and to then plan and conduct trainings in SDM in Tehama County. They began with the use of the FSNA tool, which is directly related to improved participatory case planning.

The CWS supervisors and program manager and California State Adoptions – Chico District Office supervisors provided a joint training to CWS and State Adoptions social workers on concurrent planning. A concurrent planning policy and procedure is being updated, and additional training on more effective use of concurrent planning is being planned.

Tehama County is one of four northern counties, along with Lake, Butte, and Trinity, who were successfully funded for the PSSF Regional Partnership Grant on methamphetamine prevention. Through this grant Tehama County CWS has had the benefit of having an on-site alcohol and other drug (AOD) counselor, who is able to provide early engagement, assessment and case management for clients with drug and alcohol issues. In addition, Tehama CWS has benefited from enhanced training from the Northern Regional Training Academy on topics such as with motivational interviewing and SDM.

Tehama County has had an active Dependency Drug Court (DDC) since 2007 and has found that our clients with Dependency Drug Court involvement have had a high rate of success with continued sobriety and successful reunification.

Tehama County CWS has had a mental health counselor from the Tehama County Health Services Agency, Mental Health Division (TCHSA – Mental Health) co-located two afternoons each week at Child Welfare for about a year. This counselor provides assessments of foster children, which has included assessment for Medi-Cal eligibility for mental health services. Co-location has fostered increased and enhanced communication between TCHSA - Mental Health and CWS social workers, with the result of better assessments and timelier services to children.

Tehama County CWS has worked hard to ensure consistent use of TDMs, especially for risk of removal and emergency placements, in order to enhance the children's chances of either remaining safely at home or being placed in a familiar environment.

6. New Activities

Increased use of motivational interviewing and participatory case planning activities will enhance the chances of early engagement for the clients, and of better outcomes for reunification. This will help diminish the barriers which were noted in our PQCR of client resistance, and it will also likely increase the likelihood of positive expectations of the clients on the part of the social workers.

Improved use of the SDM process, such as appropriate use of the FSNA tool in relation to participatory case planning, will enable the social workers to work with the clients towards the development of more meaningful case plans, better tailored to the client, and developed to build on a client's strengths to work with their issues.

Case plan development in a team setting will enable all parties who work with the client to be in clear communication with the client and with each other as to expectations, progress or lack thereof, and continuing issues which need to be addressed.

Being able to refer clients to an established aftercare program, developed especially for child welfare families leaving the system, will allow for increased support for the families, and some continuing accountability after they leave the child welfare system, thus decreasing the chances for recidivism and re-entry.

Tehama CWS's parent partner program has been successful in terms of providing support for and a reality check to the clients, however it has not moved beyond these activities. Involving past and current clients, including parents and youth, in an advisory, training and orientation capacity will both enhance the awareness of the social workers in meeting the needs of the clients, and will change the image the community has of the CWS system as a threatening, unforgiving system, to one comprised of people who are willing to learn from the clients, and are willing to work with and be a support to the clients.

7. Link between Activities and Outcome Improvement

Tehama's goals and strategies are geared towards better understanding and engagement of clients which in turn will translate into better outcomes for children and families. Activities directed at teaming with clients to understand their strengths and needs, valuing their participation in decision-making, and working with them to develop personalized case plans that will address their specific needs will in turn will result in faster reunification while still providing adequate support to stabilize the family and prevent re-entry to the CWS system.

Being open to learning from clients and using these lessons to improve service provision and casework will improve practice in all areas of Child Welfare. Additionally, efforts to engage family members and non-related extended family members in placement of the children if out-of-home care is necessary provides for greater stability and increased well-being of the children. Similarly, support to foster care providers, whether they be foster homes, relatives,

or NREFMs and effective concurrent planning are important pieces of ensuring positive outcomes for the children in the care of Child Welfare.

8. Integration between CSA, PQCR, and CWS/Probation Planning Process and CAPIT/CBCAP/PSSF Plan

Information gathered in the CSA, PQCR and CWS/Probation planning process have all indicated needs in terms of better case planning with clients, more comprehensive and better integrated services, which meet the clients' needs and extend beyond the time of case management by CWS/Probation. Funding from the CAPIT, CBCAP, and PSSF funding streams to community-based organizations support these goals in the following ways:

Through CAPIT Tehama County has chosen to fund home-based services for CWS clients to be provided through the local Family Resource Centers, run by Northern Valley Catholic Social Services (NVCSS runs two of the three FRCs in the county's FRC network, the third is not equipped to provide these types of services). The home visitors provide support and training services for families who need to improve their functioning in order to safely parent their children. This supports the belief that the best permanent plan and placement stability for the child is to safely remain with, or return to, their family.

Through CBCAP Tehama County has chosen to fund home-based services for families at risk of child welfare involvement, also to be provided through the local Family Resource Centers, run by Northern Valley Catholic Social Services (again, NVCSS runs two of the three FRCs in the county's FRC network, the third is not equipped to provide these types of services). The intent of these services is to decrease the numbers of children who need to come into care, and increase the numbers of healthy families who can safely parent their children without CWS intervention.

Through PSSF funding, Tehama County supports the only local domestic violence agency, Alternatives to Violence, which provides a customized program for CWS clients and also participates in Differential Response as appropriate. Further, the PSSF funds will support an Adoption Support Program to be run for the first time in many years by CWS itself, and an aftercare program at the Red Bluff Family Resource Center. There is a similar aftercare program in the Corning Family Resource Center, which is funded through the Cowell Foundation, which is also geared to working with former CWS families.

All of these programs chosen to be funded with the CBCAP, CAPIT and PSSF funds support families remaining together if possible, which is the ultimate permanent plan for children. With these services, the hope is that there will be reduced incidences of entry into the CWS system, with resultant lessened need for placement, and/or reduced re-entry. When a child must move to an alternate permanent plan, the added support for adoptive and kinship families helps to ensure that the placement remains stable and secure.

Attachments:

- CSA Executive Summary
- PQCR Executive Summary

Attachment 1: CSA Executive Summary

The County Self-Assessment (CSA) provided an opportunity for Tehama County to evaluate its performance on the CA-CFSR outcomes for children and families in context of data related to overall demographic and community-level information available for the county. While interesting to review there were few surprises in either the CA-CFSR or the community-level data.

Nevertheless, after reviewing the outcome measures and related data CWS tentatively decided to focus on children in long-term foster care in the upcoming SIP, since this population has the most disturbing data related to permanency, in terms of adoption, exits to permanency and placement stability. This would include a focus on the following measures:

- Adoption within 12 months (17 Months in Care) - Children in foster care for 17 continuous months who were then adopted within 12 months. (Measure C2.3)
- Exits to Permanency (24 Months in Care) - Children discharged to a permanent home (reunification with parents or primary caretakers, discharge to guardianship, or discharge to adoption) prior to turning 18, who had been in foster care for 24 continuous months or longer. (Measure C3.1)
- In Care 3 Years or Longer (Emancipated/Age 18) - Children in foster care for 3 years or longer who were then either discharged to emancipation or turned 18 (aka “aged-out”) while still in foster care. (Measure C3.3)
- Placement Stability (At Least 24 Months in Care) - Children with two or fewer placements who have been in foster care for 24 months or more. (Measure C4.3)
- Youth Transitioning to Self-Sufficient Adulthood – Children aging-out of foster care with one or more of the following - a high school diploma; enrollment in College/Higher Education; received Independent Living Skills Program (ILP) Services; completed vocational training; employed or have other means of support. (Measure 8A)

In addition, during a recent consultation with CDSS Tehama CWS was informed that the CDSS would likely be encouraging the county to continue to look at re-entry following reunification on the 2009-2012 SIP. If this is the case it would then be important for CWS to also look at measure C1.2 Median Time to Reunification as it may be supposed that faster reunification may mean that the family was not able to adequately make the appropriate changes in the time frame of the case and may then be more likely to become re-involved with CWS. While it is important for child well-being to reunify as quickly as possible, it is equally important that the issues which brought them into care be properly addressed so that future involvement (i.e. re-entry) be prevented.

The intent will be to put into place simple, straightforward, doable practice changes and strategies that would simultaneously make an impact on multiple focus outcomes. Tehama found that its last SIP was too varied and lofty and thus difficult to accomplish. This method of choosing to use strategies that would affect complimentary outcomes will be a more reasonable and appropriate way to accomplish the SIP goals.

Attachment 2: PQCR Executive Summary

The Peer Quality Case Review (PQCR) was an occasion for Tehama County CWS and Juvenile Probation to evaluate its practice strengths and weaknesses in qualitative format, the results of which can then be considered in compliment to the CA-CFSR outcome data. The PQCR took place between September 22-25, 2008.

The PQCR revealed that Child Welfare had strengths in making efforts to maintain educational permanency and continuity as well as general permanency planning, including such participatory case planning practices as Team Decision-making (TDM). However, it was also found that Child Welfare faces challenges in the area of placing infants in relative and/or NREFM homes rather than pre-adoptive homes that then may struggle to support reunification efforts with biologically related caregivers. On a systemic level it was noted that Child Welfare needs to better ensure that when cases are transferred that the existing social worker introduces the incoming social worker to the child/youth, foster family, education personnel, etc, as relevant to the case.

Child Welfare also faces resource issues, including transportation for children/youth and mental and behavioral health services. It was also found that while many foster children/youth receive medications there are few opportunities for caregivers to attend training on how to effectively work with these children/youth in a relationship-based way. Additionally, it was noted that addressing the characteristics of the foster home and effectively implementing “goodness of fit” practices in placement is an area for improvement.

Throughout the PQCR training needs were identified including how to use TDM and SDM appropriately and effectively; relative placement and relative location/identification including such practices as Family Finding; concurrent planning; Ways to effectively involve parents; provide training that provide more of a “hands-on” approach allowing social workers to help parents overcome resistance and noncompliance with case plan activities; making effective case transfers between social workers and other important service providers so that case management activities are not delayed; and information and training on evidence based substance abuse treatment models. Tehama CWS would likely benefit from technical assistance in several of these areas as well as in the area of the Education Passport in CWS/CMS.

Other general recommendations received and/or identified for Child Welfare during the PQCR process included the social worker visiting the youth more often to assist in developing adequate relationships, however avoid visits at the child’s school because visits at this type of location can be embarrassing for youth; when cases are transferred, having the social worker and/or probation worker meet the family with previous worker so that families do not feel that they are being passed around and to enhance more information sharing between workers; smoothing transitions for children placed in the receiving home by utilizing icebreakers and possibly having the foster

family come meet the child and engage in an enjoyable activity; assisting parents/family with transportation to visit youth in juvenile hall or group homes; offer conflict mediation services to foster parents and the youth in their care to improve placement stability; clarify the purpose and procedures of the Team Decision-making process with all child welfare partners, including both the primary goals of the process and strategies for follow-through on identified activities and revisit the participants who are included in the Team Decision-making process, including those who receive information regarding TDM goals and/or outcomes; and utilize a standardized assessment protocol and tool(s) for all children/youth who enter the foster care system. For Juvenile Probation the PQCR highlighted good support and communication as a practice strength. Probation officers were mentioned as being supportive of the youth in their case plans and for maintaining open communication. This consistent and open communication was viewed as contributing to better support for youth.

Juvenile Probation, however, does face difficulty in involving families in case planning. Both the parent who had a youth involved in probation and the probation officer mentioned that the parent and/or youth was not involved in the case planning. It appears that more support and assistance is needed for involving parents and youth in the case planning process in order to contribute to placement stability. Specifically, it was identified that Juvenile Probation would benefit from training on placement engagement and support for adolescent girls with the goal of reducing AWOLs (absent without leave or permission/run a-ways).

Additionally, Juvenile Probation faces resource challenges, namely lack of transportation. Consistent and reliable transportation is needed to better support biological caregivers in visiting youth, especially youth placed far away in group homes, which was mentioned commonly.

Through the PQCR general recommendations for improvements were made including having youth who return home receive "post-reunification" family services/more resources and support are needed for youth and families transitioning home; improving permanency and long-term placements for youth who age-out of the Juvenile Probation system, including identifying resources to assist Juvenile Probation in this effort.

Part I. CWS/Probation

a. CWS/Probation Narrative

- *Basis for decisions made regarding outcomes selected for SIP specific to CWS/Probation*

Each of the selected themes relate to outcomes in need of improvement for Tehama County. The Program Manager and CWS supervisors made the decision to focus on improvement in the area of youth in care more than 24 months without a permanent plan, for the following reasons. The first is this is an important outcome which is declining in performance in Tehama County. It is also in line with the intended outcomes of the State PIP, which focuses to a large degree on permanence for CWS children and youth. In addition, many of the chosen strategies to achieve permanence for children are also related to improved performance in placement stability, timely response, and timely social worker contacts.

For example, Strategies 1.1 (Motivational Interviewing); 1.2 (Correct and consistent use of the Family Strengths and Needs Assessment (FSNA) SDM tool, in correlation with the development of the client's case plan); and 1.3 (Use a Teaming Model in Participatory Case Planning), all relate to timely social worker visits, as they are all related to the development of the client's case plan, which must be completed within a specific time frame, and to the monitoring of the case plan progress, which also has time regulations. To frame the goals in this way adds depth and quality to the social worker visit with the client, rather than just focusing on the contact being timely. Tehama County is committed to improving performance on Outcome Measure 2C Timely Social Worker Contacts, but will focus on this without making it a separate SIP goal.

Similarly, the above-mentioned strategies, which enhance the client's ability to reunify, also foster the youth's placement stability, as the most permanent and most stable placement for the child is successful reunification with their family. In addition, placement stability is enhanced by the appropriate and timely use of the Team Decision Making (TDM) process, as described in Strategy 3.1; and Concurrent Planning, Strategy 3.2. Enhanced placement stability also leads to more timely permanence for children, and is linked to enhanced performance with timely social worker contacts. Working hand in hand with the TDM process is the goal of early identification of relatives (Strategy 3.1), which research shows fosters placement stability, as well as reunification efforts, and enhanced permanence for children should reunification fail.

Also directly related to the goal of permanency for children is a desired decrease in re-entry. Improved access to supportive aftercare case management and services (Strategy 2.1) will help families to remain stable after leaving the supportive and directive CWS system, which helps many families stay on track. This also relates to the State PIP goals of early intervention and prevention.

Regarding Outcome Measure 2B Timely Response, Tehama County has made the decision to more closely monitor this measure without adding it as a SIP goal. Having had Timely Response

as a SIP goal for the last two rounds of the SIP, Tehama County has learned what is necessary to improve on this goal. Indeed, there has been marked improvement in the past on this goal, and only a very recent decline, which is in part due to some unusual circumstances, which are currently being addressed. One goal of Tehama County is to step up activities towards improved monitoring of compliance, which includes timely recording of contacts in CWS/CMS which will be addressed with all performance outcomes.

▪ *Discussion of findings from the PQCR and CSA highlighting the connection to the SIP*

Outcomes selected for the Tehama County 2009-2012 SIP were related to the themes identified in the CSA and PQCR. These included the following:

Youth in Care more than 24 months without a Permanent Plan

Placement Stability

Timely Response

Timely Social Worker Contacts

▪ *Description of the connection between the SIP and the PIP*

On August 15, 2008, the CWDA adopted the following PIP priorities. Listed after each PIP priority is the Tehama County SIP strategy which addresses that priority.

Participatory Case Planning

Strategies 1.1 (Motivational Interviewing), 1.2 (Correct and consistent use of the Family Strengths and Needs Assessment (FSNA) SDM tool), 1.3 (Use a Teaming Model in Participatory Case Planning) and 1.4 (Document effective use of team approach to case planning in CWS/CMS contacts and in the court report) all support this PIP priority.

Foster Parent Recruitment, Retention and Support; Kinship Support

This was not directly addressed in Tehama County's 2009-2012 SIP, however Strategy 3.1 does address placement with relatives and the use of the TDM process. In the TDM process, strengths and challenges of the children/youth are addressed, and a plan is put into place to address the challenges through the enhancement of the strengths. This process does afford better support of the resource family, who is ideally a relative or NREFM of the child/youth. Strategy 3.2 (Concurrent Planning) addresses resource family support in 3.2.4 (Develop a plan to provide ongoing support and training for all Concurrent Planning Resource Families).

Education and Mental Health Services

This was not directly addressed in Tehama County's 2009-2012 SIP; however at this time Tehama County has a good plan in place to address mental health needs of children. Through participation in the PSSF Regional Partnership Grant on Meth Prevention all social workers will be trained in conducting a developmental assessment on all children entering care, via use of the Ages and Stages Questionnaire. Also through participation in this grant, CWS has been able to

have a full-time Alcohol and Other Drugs (AOD) counselor on-site. Thus far, this counselor has been working with the adults involved in CWS cases with alcohol and/or drug dependency issues, but this coming year there will be more emphasis on meeting the mental health and other needs of the children as well. In addition, for about 18 months, CWS has been fortunate to have a co-located Mental Health counselor, who conducts initial mental health assessments on Tehama County CWS children and youth, qualifies the child or youth for Medi-Cal eligibility for Mental Health services, and facilitates referrals to services. Thus, Tehama County did not find it necessary to add this into the SIP goals.

Prevention and Early Intervention

Tehama County implemented Differential Response in 2005. At this time, it is an established practice for Tehama County CWS. Tehama County has a well-established protocol and procedure for Path I responses, and an established relationship with our Family Resource Centers, which provide a comprehensive and effective home visiting program, as well as other FRC services for families. It would be beneficial for Tehama County to look more closely at how the use of the Path II response, to the enhancement of prevention and early intervention. However, because the Differential Response program is well-established, it was not chosen as a goal for the 2009-2012 SIP.

- *Process used to develop outcome goals, strategies, rationales, and milestones*

This was discussed in the SIP Narrative.

- *Address/discuss all outcomes identified as an area needing improvement in the CSA*

This was discussed in the SIP Narrative.

- *Address/discuss outcomes which are performing below statewide standards, primarily outcomes for which quarterly data reports reflect a negative data trend*

This was discussed in the SIP Narrative, and is outlined in the SIP Matrix, under the heading Outcome/Systemic Factor and County's Current Performance.

b. CWS/Probation Matrix

Please see matrices below.

Outcome/Systemic Factor: C1.2 Median Time to Reunification (Exit Cohort)

County's Current Performance: According to the July 2009 CWS Outcomes System Summary Report for Tehama County (Data Extract Q4 2008) prepared by the UC Berkeley Center for Social Services Research¹ Tehama County's Median Time to Reunification (Exit Cohort) in the calendar year 2008 was 6.4 months. Data graphs included in this UC Berkeley report indicate that Tehama's Median Time to Reunification has been rising since the 12-month reporting period ending 12/31/2004.

According to SafeMeasures² Tehama's Median Time to Reunification (Exit Cohort) in the 12-month period ending June 2009 was 2.2 months for children reunified within 12 months (80.3% or 53 children) and 15.5 for children not reunified within 12 months (19.7% or 13 children) with an overall total Median Time to Reunification for the total 66 children reunified between 7/1/09-6/30/08 of 4.4 months. SafeMeasures data indicates that this most recent measurement of 4.4 months is the lowest that Tehama has managed during any reporting period shown on SafeMeasures at the time accessed (8/24/09), the earliest of which is 7/1/05-6/30/06.

Improvement Goal 1.0 Decrease the Median Time to Reunification to meet the National Standard/Goal of 5.4 months.

Strategy 1.1 Motivational Interviewing (MI)		Strategy Rationale CWS Social Workers use of Motivational Interviewing will enhance the client's ability and willingness to engage with the social worker and decrease the time to engaging in services.	
Milestone	Timeframe		Assigned to
	1.1.1 Train all Social Workers and Supervisors on Motivational Interviewing.	By October 2009	
	1.1.2 Social Workers to receive Motivational Interviewing coaching, beginning with the court Social Workers.	Begin in August 2009; continuous through July 2010	
	1.1.3 Court Social Workers and all Supervisors consistently use motivational Interviewing as a tool.	By October 2009	
	1.1.4 All Social Workers and all Supervisors consistently use Motivational Interviewing as a tool.	By August 2010	
		CWS Social Workers, CWS Supervisors	
		CWS Social Workers, MI Coaches through Northern Regional Training Academy, and Supervisors to monitor	
		CWS Social Workers; CWS Supervisors to monitor and model	
		CWS Social Workers; CWS Supervisors to monitor and model	

¹ Needell, B., Webster, D., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Dawson, W., Magruder, J., Exel, M., Glasser, T., Williams, D., Zimmerman, K., Simon, V., Putnam-Hornstein, E., Frerer, K., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Winn, A., Lou, & Peng, C. (2009). Child Welfare Services Outcomes System Summary Report published July 2009.

² Children's Research Center SafeMeasures Data. Tehama County CFSR Measures C1.1. and C1.2: Reunification within 12 Months (Exit Cohort). Retrieved 8/24/09 from Children's Research Center website. URL: <https://www.safemeasures.org/ca/safemeasures.aspx>.

Strategy 1.2			Strategy Rationale	
Correct and consistent use of the Family Strengths and Needs Assessment (FSNA) SDM tool, in correlation with the development of the client's case plan.			Through correct and consistent use of the FSNA, in collaboration with the client, the social worker will be able to successfully tailor the client's case plan to that client's needs, and the strengths for the client to get the needs met, which will assist the client in successful timely reunification with their child(ren).	
Milestone	1.2.1 Assessment of CWS Social Workers use of the FSNA tool.	By September 2009	Assigned to	Brad Seiser and Tom Taylor of the Northern Regional Training Academy, all CWS Supervisors, Program Manager
	1.2.2 Develop a corrective plan of action in relation to the use of the FSNA tool.	By October 2009		Brad Seiser and Tom Taylor of the Northern Regional Training Academy, all CWS Supervisors, Program Manager
	1.2.3 Training for CWS Social Workers, CWS Supervisors and Program Manager on the FSNA tool as deemed necessary, per the assessment and corrective action plan.	By December 2009		Northern Regional Training Academy; CWS social worker Supervisors and Program Manager
	1.2.4 Monthly monitoring of CWS cases, to assure that the FSNA is being used prior to the development of a case plan, and that the case plan goals are consistent with the findings on the FSNA for each client.	Beginning January 2010 and ongoing		CWS Supervisors and Program Manager
Strategy 1.3			Strategy Rationale	
Fully implement participatory case planning utilizing a family team model. The team will include the court social worker, the ongoing social worker, and the client, at a minimum. The team can also include potential or current service providers, and a Linkages/CalWORKs Employment Training Worker or Eligibility Worker.			When clients participate in their own case plan, they will own it and be more likely to succeed. When the client meets with the team who will assist and monitor the client in their case plan compliance and progress, the client will less likely be able to triangulate these persons and will more likely to be accountable for their actions and behaviors and how they relate to the level of success with the case plan.	
Milestone	1.3.1 Research and choose a model to use for a team approach to developing a case plan with clients and collaterals.	By January 2010	Assigned to	Program Manager and Staff Services Analyst, with assistance from CWS Supervisors and feedback from Social Workers
	1.3.2 Train facilitators in the chosen team model for creating a case plan with clients and collaterals.	By March 2010		Social Worker Supervisor assigned to developing participatory case practice
	1.3.3	By June 2010		Team facilitators and Social Worker

	Train Social Workers in the chosen team model for creating a case plan with clients and collaterals.			Supervisor assigned to developing participatory case practice
	1.3.4 Social Workers consistently use the chosen team model for creating a case plan with their clients.		By June 2010 and ongoing	CWS Social Workers; Supervisors to monitor
	Strategy 1.4 Document effective use of team approach to case planning in CWS/CMS case notes and in the court report.		Strategy Rationale Documentation of the team approach in the court report and in CWS/CMS contacts will educate the court, attorneys and other parties as to how the client is involved in creating his/her own case plan, and of the supportive nature of this engagement. The hope is that this will then decrease and/or eliminate attorney resistance to the client working with the social worker as well as foster court support for and encouragement of such.	
Milestone	1.4.1 Develop a policy and procedure that will state that all Social Workers will document in the section of the case plan that asks for client's perception of their needs, the social worker's efforts to include the client in the development of their case plan.	Timeframe	By September 2009	Assigned to Program Manager, with input from the CWS Supervisors and County Counsel and assistance of the Staff Services Analyst
	1.4.2 Train all Social Workers in the new procedure.		By November 2009	CWS Supervisors, County Counsel, and System Support Analyst
	1.4.3 CWS Social Worker Supervisors monitor Social Workers compliance with this procedure.		November 2009 and ongoing	CWS Supervisors
Notes: No CAPIT/CBCAP/PSSF funds are being used to support any of the above goals or strategies.				
Describe systemic changes needed to further support the improvement goal. <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Strategy 1.1: Social Workers, particularly those who have worked for the department for several years, are used to writing the case plan for the client without the client present, then presenting the document to the client for the client to sign. A necessary systemic change would be that Social Workers and all CWS staff recognize that the clients have valuable knowledge and insights into their own needs and strengths and that Social Workers, rather than working alone, work with a team to develop the plan for the client, with the client in the center. When asked in the right way most clients will be able to say what has worked for them in the past and the case plan strategies can then be tailored to a plan that will work best for that client.▪ Strategy 1.2: Social Workers will have to gain a deeper understanding of the FSNA tool, including for Social Workers who have been at the department for several years, a knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of how the tools have been changed and improved. Social Workers who do not use the tool at all will need to get in the habit of using the tool and using it correctly including appropriate application of the definitions. Social Workers who have gotten into the habit of completing the tool as a rote exercise, with no understanding or use of the definitions, or who complete the tool but with no relation to what is then developed as a case plan for the client, will need to learn to use the tool more meaningfully, and prior to the development of a case plan.				

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategy 1.3: Currently Social Workers work independently to develop a case plan for the client and make up their own minds after talking with the client, staffing the case with their supervisor, and reviewing the petition as to what should be in the case plan. Most case plans are fairly standard and not very much tailored to the particular client. Social Workers are getting used to the idea of a team approach to decision making with increasing acceptance of and participation in the TDM process, most recently assisted by the division's focus on increasing compliance with TDMs, particularly emergency placement and risk of removal TDMs. However, to move into a team approach to case planning will require a culture shift, and a rescheduling of how workers plan to get their work done and how they plan their day. It will likely involve more advance planning, and a willingness to accept and even bend to another's point of view of what is needed for a client to successfully reunify with his/her child(ren). Another needed systemic change will be to educate the courts and attorneys who represent CWS clients in the courts to the reasons for the team approach to case plan development and why that will benefit the CWS clients. ▪ Strategy 1.4: This improvement goal will not require significant systemic changes, only a change in practice regarding documenting the changes in procedure outlined in Strategy 1.3 	<p>Describe educational/training needs (including technical assistance) to achieve the improvement goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategy 1.1: Most Social Workers have been trained in Motivational Interviewing, some twice per their request. New Social Workers who are hired and Social Workers who missed the Motivational Interviewing trainings will need to attend. All current Supervisors have attended the Motivational Interviewing training. If there is a turnover in Supervisors, the new supervisor(s) will need to attend. Motivational Interviewing coaching is currently being provided to all of the Social Workers who write the initial case plans, which in most units is the court social worker. In the Corning sub-station, where the workers do vertical case management, two Social Workers have chosen to receive Motivational Interviewing coaching. These Social Workers will be the "champions" for Motivational Interviewing. Gradually more Social Workers will be identified to receive Motivational Interviewing coaching, until all Social Workers have had the benefit of this coaching. ▪ Strategy 1.2: All Social Workers will need training in the FSNA tool. For newer workers this may be a first time training, for those who have been with the department longer it may be a refresher and an update to the newer definitions. The training will need to be a motivational training to help the Social Workers understand the importance of actually using the FSNA tool, using it with the client, and using the results to drive the development of the case plan. CWS Supervisors will also need to be trained to have a better understanding of what is being expected of the Social Workers. ▪ Strategy 1.3: Research and training on models such as Family Team Conferencing to inform CWS's choice of models to apply to this strategy. Once a team model is chosen for participatory case planning, all case carrying Social Workers and CWS Supervisors will need to be trained in the model. Facilitators will need to be chosen and trained in the facilitation needed for the model. It may be beneficial to have a training for community stakeholders, to foster understanding of the process and why is has been deemed to be more effective in promoting successful reunification for families. ▪ Strategy 1.4: Social Workers will need to be trained in documentation in CWS/CMS and court reports per the new P & P developed as part of this strategy.
<p>Identify roles of the other partners in achieving the improvement goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategy 1.1: Partnership with the Northern Regional Training Academy will be necessary to achieve this strategy. ▪ Strategy 1.2: Partnership with the Northern Regional Training Academy will be necessary to achieve this strategy. ▪ Strategy 1.3: Meaningful participation by service providers and other case managers (e.g. the CalWORKs Employment Training Worker and/or the client's Eligibility Worker) will greatly enhance the effectiveness of participatory case planning. ▪ Strategy 1.4: Not applicable. <p>Identify any regulatory or statutory changes needed to support the accomplishment of the improvement goals.</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>10/1/2009Teahama County SIP 2009</p> <p>Page 26</p>

Outcome/Systemic Factor: C1.4 Rate of Re-Entry Following Reunification (Exit Cohort)

County's Current Performance: According to the July 2009 CWS Outcomes System Summary Report for Tehama County (Data Extract Q4 2008) prepared by the UC Berkeley Center for Social Services Research,³ Tehama County's rate of Reentry Following Reunification (Exit Cohort) in the calendar year 2007 was 22.6%. Data graphs included in this UC Berkeley report indicate that Tehama's rate of Reentry Following Reunification (Exit Cohort) has been rising since the 12-month reporting period ending 6/30/05.

According to SafeMeasures⁴ Tehama's rate of Reentry Following Reunification in the 12-month period ending June 2008 was 11.1%. SafeMeasures data indicates that this most recent measurement of 11.1% is the lowest reported for Tehama since the reporting period ending September 2005.

Improvement Goal 1.0 Decrease the Rate of Re-Entry Following Reunification to meet the National Standard/Goal 9.9%.

Strategy 1. 1 Improve access to supportive aftercare case management and services for clients after they leave the Child Welfare system.		Strategy Rationale When families leave the CWS system, they often lose the support and structure of case management which helped keep them stable. Families will benefit from a non-CWS case management and support system in the first 6 months after they leave the CWS system.	
Milestone	1.1.1 Develop policy and procedure for referring CWS clients to aftercare case management and services through the FRC network, when preparing to return child(ren) home and close the CWS case.	By September 2009	Program Manager, with assistance from CWS Supervisors and feedback from CWS Social Workers
	1.1.2 Train CWS Social Workers on the aftercare services available through the FRC network, and on the procedure for referring clients to this program.	By October 2009	NVCSS staff from Family Resource centers in Corning and Red Bluff; CWS Social Workers; CWS Supervisors
	1.1.3 Monitor social worker referrals of Child Welfare parents to aftercare case management and services through the FRC network, when preparing to return child(ren) home and close the CWS case.	By November 2009	CWS Social Workers, CWS Supervisors to monitor; System Support Analyst to provide data
	Timeframe		Assigned to

³ Needell, B., Webster, D., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Dawson, W., Magruder, J., Exel, M., Glasser, T., Williams, D., Zimmerman, K., Simon, V., Putnam-Hornstein, J., Frerer, K., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Winn, A., Lou, & Peng, C. (2009). Child Welfare Services Outcomes System Summary Report published July 2009.

⁴ Children's Research Center SafeMeasures Data. Tehama County CWSR Measure C1.4: Reentry Following Reunification (Exit Cohort). Retrieved 8/25/09 from Children's Research Center website. URL: <https://www.safemeasures.org/ca/safemeasures.aspx>.

Strategy 1.2 Include Child Welfare parents and youth, current and past, in advisory, orientation, and training capacities to Child Welfare staff and resource families.		Strategy Rationale CWS will benefit from the knowledge and experience of how CWS clients, (adults and youth) have responded to case management and services provided, and the perceived effectiveness of this case management and services, toward the goal of improving our services to clients, for improved outcomes.	
Milestone	1.2.1 Research how other counties include CWS clients, (adult and youth) past and present, in an advisory, orientation, and training capacity.	By April 2010	Assigned to CWS Supervisors, Parent Partner, and Staff Services Analyst/Staff Services Analyst/F2F Coordinator CWS Supervisors, through consultation with Social Workers, Parent Partner, and Staff Services Analyst/Staff Services Analyst/F2F Coordinator CWS Supervisors, through consultation with Social Workers, Parent Partner, and Staff Services Analyst/F2F Coordinator
	1.2.2 Develop a list of clients (adult and youth), past and current, to serve in an advisory capacity.	By June 2010 and ongoing	
	1.2.3 Devise plan to include parents and youth who are current or previous CWS clients, in advisory, orientation, and training capacities on existing workgroups and committees.	By August 2010	
Strategy 1.3 Social Workers will hold exit/reunification TDMs for every family for whom reunification is likely/imminent.		Strategy Rationale Family participation in the decision around when to reunify their family as well as contribution to the plan to facilitate and support such reunification will contribute to better outcomes for the family, including a reduced likelihood of reentry into the Child Welfare system.	
Milestone	1.3.1 Review and revise policy and procedure for exit/reunification TDMs as necessary to ensure it includes a step-by-step procedure for arranging and attending reunification TDMs and for TDM follow-up.	By February 2010	Assigned to CWS Program Manager, with assistance from CWS Supervisors, Staff Services Analyst/F2F Coordinator, and input from CWS Social Workers CWS Program Manager to arrange and monitor training attendance; CWS Supervisors, Staff Services Analyst/F2F Coordinator CWS Supervisors and Program Manager
	1.3.2 Training for all CWS Social Workers and CWS Social Worker Supervisors on exit/reunification TDMs; refresher trainings for those who have previously received the training, new trainings for those who have not.	By April 2010	
	1.3.3	From April 2010 and ongoing	

Monitor the appropriate scheduling of, attendance at, and follow up from exit/reunification TDM's.		
Notes: PSSF funds are being used to support the development and provision of an aftercare program through the Red Bluff FRC.		
Describe systemic changes needed to further support the improvement goal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategy 1.1: This strategy will not require a significant systemic change, except for the Social Workers to embrace referring the clients to aftercare services. ▪ Strategy 1.2: This strategy will require a shift in system culture and practice to include and value clients for their knowledge, expertise and to find appropriate ways to learn from their strengths and unique perspectives. ▪ Strategy 1.3: It is likely that full implementation of exit/reunification TDMs will preclude the need for case staffings which are currently held to assist the Social Worker in making the decision whether to reunify the family. If so, it will require a culture shift for the Social Workers to move to a facilitated team meeting in which the decision to reunify will be made. 		
Describe educational/training needs (including technical assistance) to achieve the improvement goals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategy 1.1: The Social Workers will need to be trained regarding the aftercare services which are made available through the Family Resource Centers in Corning and Red Bluff, and will need to be trained in the policy and procedure for referring the clients to aftercare. ▪ Strategy 1.2: Research into, training on, and subsequently possible implementation of the Building Better Futures program offered through the Family-to-Family initiative is likely to be a part of the accomplishment of this strategy. ▪ Strategy 1.3: Social Workers and Supervisors will need training on exit/reunification TDMs. New Social Workers and any new Supervisors who have not been trained on exit/reunification TDMs will need an initial training. Social Workers and Supervisors who have been trained, but have not been using exit/reunification TDMs per the model, will need a refresher training that includes any updates to the exit/reunification TDM process that were instituted since they were originally trained. 		
Identify roles of the other partners in achieving the improvement goals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategy 1.1: In order to have success it will be necessary that the provider operating the aftercare program work in collaboration with Child Welfare to develop and implement a program that meets the needs of former CWS clients effectively. ▪ Strategy 1.2: Meaningful and appropriate participation of Child Welfare parents and youth, both current and past, in advisory, orientation, and training capacities is critical to the success of this strategy. ▪ Strategy 1.3: Meaningful and appropriate participation of service providers and others involved with the family will make the exit/reunification TDMs more successful, which ultimately will contribute to making the family more successful at maintaining stability. 		
Identify any regulatory or statutory changes needed to support the accomplishment of the improvement goals. Not applicable.		

Outcome/Systemic Factor: C4.3 Placement Stability (At least 24 months in Care)

County's Current Performance: According to the July 2009 CWS Outcomes System Summary Report for Tehama County (Data Extract Q4 2008) prepared by the UC Berkeley Center for Social Services Research⁵ Tehama County's rate of Placement Stability (At Least 24 Months in Care) in the calendar year 2008 was 31.1%. Data graphs included in this UC Berkeley report indicate that Tehama's rate of Placement Stability (At Least 24 Months in Care) has been rising since the 12-month reporting period ending 12/31/04.

According to SafeMeasures⁶ Tehama's rate for the 12-month period ending June 2009 of children/youth in care for over 24 months experiencing no more than two placement settings was 33.7% and 66.3% for those experiencing three or more placement settings. SafeMeasures data indicates that this most recent period of measurement is the best reported for Tehama since the reporting period ending June 2006.

Improvement Goal 1.0 Improve Placement Stability for youth in care 24 months or more to meet the National Standard/Goal of 41.8%.

Strategy 1.1		Strategy Rationale	
Increased placement with relatives or NREFMs, aided by the consistent use of Emergency Placement TDMs that include relatives/NREFMs who are potential placement resources.		Research shows that children placed with relatives experience more stability in placement. Research of practice shows that use of Emergency Placement TDMs is effective in increasing the #'s of children placed with relatives or NREFM's.	
Milestone	Timeframe		Assigned to
	1.1.1 Revise policy and procedure regarding Emergency Placement TDMs to include step-by-step procedure for arranging for, attending, and follow-up from TDMs.	By September 2009	
	1.1.2 Train all CWS Social Workers on the Policy and Procedure for arranging for Emergency Placement TDMs.	By October 2009	
	1.1.3 In 90% of cases where children are removed, an Emergency Placement TDM will be held within 24 hours (or on the next business day if removal occurs over a weekend) and prior to a detention petition being heard in Court.	By October 2009 and ongoing	CWS Supervisors, Staff Services Analyst/F2F Coordinator
			CWS Social Workers; CWS Supervisors to monitor and attend

⁵ Needell, B., Webster, D., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Dawson, W., Magruder, J., Exel, M., Glasser, T., Williams, D., Zimmerman, K., Simon, V., Putnam-Hornstein, E., Freier, K., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Winn, A., Lou, & Peng, C. (2009). Child Welfare Services Outcomes System Summary Report published July 2009.

⁶ Children's Research Center SafeMeasures Data: Tehama County CFSR Measure C4.3: Placement Stability (Over 24 Months in Care). Retrieved 8/25/09 from Children's Research Center website. URL: <https://www.safemeasures.org/ca/safemeasures.aspx>.

Strategy 1.2 Full implementation of Icebreakers.			Strategy Rationale	
Milestone	Timeframe		Assigned to	
1.2.1 Review existing policy and procedure and put into standard TCDSS format.			By February 2009	Program Manager, CWS Supervisors, Staff Services Analyst/F2F Coordinator
1.2.2 Training/refresher training for all Social Workers and Supervisors.			By April 2009	Program Manager, CWS Supervisors, Staff Services Analyst/F2F Coordinator
1.2.3 Training/refresher training for all foster care providers (foster and FFA) and FFA staff. *Relatives/NREFMs will be oriented to this process when they are preparing to accept placement of a child.			By June 2009	Program Manager, CWS Supervisors, Staff Services Analyst/F2F Coordinator
Strategy 1.3 Concurrent Planning			Strategy Rationale The best permanent placement for a child, when it can be safely arranged, is to return home. When a child cannot be safely returned home, the best permanent plan is to remain in the same resource family with whom s/he is initially placed.	
Milestone	Timeframe		Assigned to	
1.3.1 Develop policy and procedure regarding concurrent Planning.			By September 2009	Program Manager, with assistance of CWS Social Worker Supervisors and with input from CWS Social Workers and in collaboration with California State Adoptions, Chico office.
1.3.2 Schedule regular monthly concurrent planning case reviews with State Adoptions. Discuss permanency options, including implementation of a Family for Life (FFL) team and plan for each youth.			By August 2009	CWS Supervisor assigned to Concurrent Planning in collaboration with California State Adoptions, Chico office.
1.3.3 Train all CWS Social Workers and CWS Supervisors on concurrent planning.			By January 2010	Program Manager to arrange for training, in conjunction with State Adoptions
1.3.4 Train all new resource families on concurrent planning, and provide a refresher training for all existing foster care providers.			Within the next PRIDE training, to commence January 2010	Foster Parent PRIDE trainers FP Liaison; Placement Social Worker
1.3.5			March 2010	CWS Placement Social Worker and

<p>A special set training, to include all new and established foster parents, CWS Social Workers, and Supervisors using AB2129 funds.</p>	<p>1.3.6 Develop a plan to provide ongoing support and training for all concurrent planning resource families.</p>	<p>By January 2010</p>	<p>Supervisor; Foster Parent Liaison; Representative from California State Adoptions</p>
			<p>CWS Supervisor assigned to Concurrent Planning; CWS Social Worker assigned to Concurrent Planning; FP Liaison; Placement Social Worker; State Adoptions Social Worker or Supervisor</p>
	<p>1.3.7 Implement above plan for ongoing support and training for all concurrent planning resource families.</p>	<p>By March 2010 and ongoing</p>	<p>CWS Supervisor assigned to Concurrent Planning; CWS Social Worker assigned to Concurrent Planning; FP Liaison; Placement Social Worker; State Adoptions Social Worker or Supervisor</p>

Notes:

PSSF funds for adoption support *may* be used to support parts of Strategy 1.3.

Describe systemic changes needed to further support the improvement goal.

- **Strategy 1.1:** Emergency Placement TDMs are currently being utilized, but not with a consistency that is deemed to be good practice. Many are being missed, either due to Social Worker resistance to bringing a parent into a Team Decision-making meeting, or due to lack of understanding of the process, and of the benefits to using the Emergency Placement TDM. Training and Supervisor buy-in and consistent monitoring will help to increase performance on this activity.
- **Strategy 1.2:** A policy and procedure for conducting Icebreakers already exists, however it has not been mandatory up to this point for Social Workers to use this practice. Requiring Social Workers to implement Icebreakers will likely result in some resistance from workers who perceive this as a great strain on their workload. However, with a thorough understanding of the practice and upon experiencing the benefits of taking this approach to placement stabilization Social Worker buy-in will likely improve.
- **Strategy 1.3:** Child Welfare Social Workers and Supervisors will need to develop a better understanding of concurrent planning. Many Social Workers and some Supervisors believe that it is too difficult, if not impossible, for a resource family to make a commitment to permanency for a child while at the same time actively supporting reunification efforts. When the focus is on what is best for the child, the benefits of concurrent planning become obvious. Currently most Social Workers and some Supervisors view concurrent planning as something which happens when the recommendation is to terminate reunification and establish permanency, rather than at the beginning of a case. The shift needs to be to an attitude that it is okay to ask a resource family to concurrently plan for permanency while supporting reunification, because it is in the best interest of the child.

Describe educational/training needs (including technical assistance) to achieve the improvement goals.

- **Strategy 1.1:** Social Workers and Supervisors need additional training on Emergency Placement TDMs to deepen their understanding of this practice, inform them of successes when used in other counties, help to alleviate their concerns about this practice, and help to eliminate barriers to them fully embracing of the implementation of this practice.
- **Strategy 1.2:** Social Workers and Supervisors will participate in training/refreshers training on the use of Icebreakers.
- **Strategy 1.3:** Social Workers and Supervisors need to be educated in the basic tenets of concurrent planning, and why it can be successful. This education should include success stories when concurrent planning is appropriately implemented. Social Workers and Supervisors need to be

trained in how resource families can be encouraged to engage in concurrent planning, and how they can receive appropriate and needed support for this.	
<p>Identify roles of the other partners in achieving the improvement goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategy 1.1: Meaningful and appropriate participation of relatives and NREFMS, as well as service providers and others involved with the family, will make the Emergency Placement TDMs more successful and complete. ▪ Strategy 1.2: The support of Tehama CWS's FFA partners will be integral in accomplishing Icebreakers when the placement involves an FFA home. ▪ Strategy 1.3: A shared vision and commitment to the goal between CWS and State Adoptions is critical to the success of this strategy. 	
Identify any regulatory or statutory changes needed to support the accomplishment of the improvement goals.	
Not applicable.	

Outcome/Systemic Factor: Parent Engagement (Juvenile Probation)

County's Current Performance: Parents of minors placed out of the home need to provide more input as to the needs of the minor and family. This led to less than successful placement outcomes for minors when the parents were not engaged and had no buy-in.

Improvement Goal 1.0 Increase parental engagement through multi-agency collaborations with emphasis on family based case planning. By inclusion of family at every point of involvement with the minor's placement case it will train probation officer's to put the emphasis on family issues not just issues of the minor when case planning.

Strategy 1.1 Effectively involve parents in case planning.		Strategy Rationale Parents input will increase value and investment in case plan.	
Milestone	1.1.1 Supervising probation officer will meet with parents as soon as possible after jurisdiction and prior to disposition to gather family history, etc. for the dispositional report and recommendation. If placement is going to be recommended, a case plan is written. Parents will be involved as much as possible with the case plan development. The case plan shall be pertinent to the family's needs and related to successful reunification.	Timeframe	Assigned to
	1.1.1.1 Probation supervisors monitor the probation officer's compliance and follow through with the process described in Strategy 1.1.1.	September 2010	Supervising Probation Officer
	1.1.1.2 After the dispositional hearing if/when out of home placement is ordered, case will be transferred to the placement officer to locate a placement for the minor that best fits the minor's needs.	September 2010	Probation Supervisors
	1.1.1.3 Placement officer will meet with the parents monthly to go over the progress on the case plan, including on-going assessment as to whether the case plan is continuing to meet the needs of the family.	September 2010	Placement Officer
	1.1.1.4 Placement officer will meet with the parents monthly to go over the progress on the case plan, including on-going assessment as to whether the case plan is continuing to meet the needs of the family.	October 2010	Placement Officer
Notes:			
CAPIT/CBCAP/PSSF funds are not being used to support any Juvenile Probation strategies as such is prohibited.			
Describe systemic changes needed to further support the improvement goal.			

The placement officer will engage the parents and minor at the beginning stages of the case planning process by dedicating enough time to develop a working rapport with the family to enhance reunification.

Describe educational/training needs (including technical assistance) to achieve the improvement goals.

None.

Identify roles of the other partners in achieving the improvement goals.

None.

Identify any regulatory or statutory changes needed to support the accomplishment of the improvement goals.

None.

c. CWSOIP Narrative

In order to achieve CWS goals of timely referrals and increased response times, the CWSOIP funds were used as follows:

1. Funded contract with Northern Valley Catholic Social Services for the Ameri-Corp program to provide additional support at their Family Resource Center for the Differential Response clients CWS referred there, either through Path 1, Path 2, or Path 3.
2. Funded contract with Northern Valley Catholic Social Services for the Family Resource Center for the Differential Response clients CWS referred there, either through Path 1, Path 2, or Path 3.
3. Salaries for parent partners, who make home visits and assist Social Workers.
4. Enhanced family finding efforts using the internet and special sites developed for locations of persons.
5. Provided trainings to staff to discuss outcome improvement strategies and get feedback of the changes in procedures.

Probation was able to use the CWSOIP funds to provide a probation child a bus ticket in order to make a visit to his parents.

MINUTE ORDER
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF TEHAMA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

R E G U L A R A G E N D A

TEHAMA COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES – Approval of the California Child and Family Services Review System Improvement Plan to be Submitted to the California Department of Social Services

Following discussion, a motion was made by Supervisor Avilla, seconded by Supervisor Willard and carried by the unanimous vote of the Board members present to approve the California Child and Family Services Review System Improvement Plan to be submitted to the California Department of Social Services.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)ss
COUNTY OF TEHAMA)

I, BEVERLY ROSS, County Clerk and ex-officio Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Tehama, State of California, hereby certify the above and foregoing to be a full, true and correct copy of an order adopted by said Board of Supervisors on the 20th day of October, 2009.

DATED: October 27, 2009

BEVERLY ROSS, County Clerk and
Ex-officio Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
of the County of Tehama, State of California

By Mackenzie Berkman Deputy